

1 JONATHAN F. MITCHELL *
2 jonathan@mitchell.law
3 Mitchell Law PLLC
4 106 East Sixth Street, Suite 900
5 Austin, Texas 78701
6 (512) 686-3940 (phone)
7 (512) 686-3940 (fax)

* admitted *pro hac vice*

8 CHRISTOPHER HELLMICH
9 chellmich@hellmichlaw.com
10 California Bar No. 224169
11 Hellmich Law Group, PC
12 5753-G E. Santa Ana Canyon Rd. #512
13 Anaheim Hills, California 92807
14 (949) 287-5708 (phone)
15 (714) 974- 7733 (fax)

Counsel for Plaintiffs and Proposed Class

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18 SOUTHERN DIVISION

19
20 **Georgia Babb; John J. Frangiamore**
21 **Jr.; William Happ; Aaron**
22 **Holbrook; Michelle Pecanic-Lee;**
23 **David Schmus; and Abram van der**
24 **Fluit, as individuals, and on behalf of**
25 **all others similarly situated,**

26
Plaintiffs,

Case No. 8:18-cv-00994-JLS-DFM

**Plaintiffs' Third Amended
Class-Action Complaint**

1 v.

2 **California Teachers Association;**
3 **United Teachers of Los Angeles,** as
4 representative of the class of all
5 chapters and affiliates of the
6 California Teachers Association;
7 **National Education Association;**
8 **Eric Banks, Priscilla Winslow,**
9 **Erich Shiners, and Arthur A.**
10 **Krantz,** in their official capacities as
11 chairman and members of the
12 California Public Employment
13 Relations Board,
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Defendants.

Georgia Babb, John J. Frangiamore Jr., William Happ, Aaron Holbrook, Michelle Pecanic-Lee, David Schmus, and Abram van der Fluit are current or former public-school teachers who bring this class action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, seeking redress for the defendants' past and ongoing violations of their constitutionally protected rights. The defendants have violated the representative plaintiffs' constitutional rights by forcing them to pay compulsory "fair share service fees" to the California Teachers Association and its chapters and affiliates as a condition of their employment, even though the representative plaintiffs do not belong to this union and do not wish to subsidize the union's activities. The representative plaintiffs seek a refund of all unlawfully collected "fair share service fees," an injunction that forbids the defendants to collect union fees from nonmembers without their consent, and costs and attorneys' fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 28 U.S.C. § 1343, and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

2. Venue is proper because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims occurred in this judicial district. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff Georgia Babb resides in Sandoval County, New Mexico.

4. Plaintiff John J. Frangiamore Jr. resides in Orange County, California.

5. Plaintiff William Happ resides in Butte County, California.

6. Plaintiff Aaron Holbrook resides in Riverside County, California.

7. Plaintiff Michelle Pecanic-Lee resides in Los Angeles County, California.

1 8. Plaintiff David Schmus resides in Orange County, California.

2 9. Plaintiff Abram van der Fluit resides in Los Angeles County, Califor-
3 nia.

4 10. Defendant California Teachers Association (CTA) is a labor union
5 whose offices are located at 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, California
6 94010. It has more than 1,300 chapters and affiliates throughout the State.

7 11. Defendant United Teachers of Los Angeles is a local union chapter
8 affiliated with the California Teachers Association. Its offices are located at
9 303 Wilshire Boulevard, 10th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010. It is sued
10 as representative of the class of all chapters and affiliates of the CTA.

11 12. Defendant National Education Association (NEA) is a labor union
12 whose headquarters are located at 1201 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C.
13 The NEA is affiliated with the CTA.

14 13. Defendants Eric Banks, Priscilla Winslow, Erich Shiners, and Arthur
15 A. Krantz are members of the California Public Employment Relations
16 Board, the entity that oversees public-sector collective bargaining in Califor-
17 nia and administers the State's labor and collective-bargaining laws, includ-
18 ing Cal. Gov't Code § 3546, which the defendants are challenging as uncon-
19 stitutional. They are all sued in their official capacities.

20 **STATEMENT OF THE CLAIM**

21 14. Ms. Babb is a public-school teacher who was employed by the Nuview
22 School District in California from 2000 through 2006. She is currently em-
23 ployed by the Rio Rancho Public Schools in New Mexico. While she was
24 teaching at Nuview, Ms. Babb refused to join the CTA or its affiliates be-
25 cause she disapproved of their political advocacy and collective-bargaining
26 activities and did not wish to support them in any way. Nevertheless, Ms.

1 Babb was forced to pay “fair share service fees” to the CTA as a condition of
2 her continued employment. *See* Cal. Gov’t Code § 3546(a).

3 15. Mr. Frangimore is a public-school teacher who currently works in a
4 non-union school district, but previously worked for the Compton Unified
5 School District (1990–96) and the Bellflower Unified School District (1996–
6 2016), both of which were agency shops. Mr. Frangimore refused to join the
7 CTA or its affiliates during that time because he disapproved of their politi-
8 cal advocacy and collective-bargaining activities and did not wish to support
9 them in any way. Nevertheless, Mr. Frangimore was forced to pay “fair
10 share service fees” to the CTA as a condition of his continued employment.
11 *See* Cal. Gov’t Code § 3546(a).

12 16. Mr. Happ is a retired public-school teacher who taught in the Cali-
13 fornia public schools for 27 years. Mr. Happ refused to join the CTA or its
14 affiliates because he disapproved of their political advocacy and collective-
15 bargaining activities and did not wish to support them in any way. Neverthe-
16 less, Mr. Happ was forced to pay “fair share service fees” to the CTA as a
17 condition of his continued employment. *See* Cal. Gov’t Code § 3546(a).

18 17. Mr. Holbrook is a public-school teacher who taught in the San Jacinto
19 Unified School District until June of 2017. He now teaches in a non-union
20 charter school. Mr. Holbrook refused to join the CTA or its affiliates because
21 he disapproved of their political advocacy and collective-bargaining activities
22 and did not wish to support them in any way. Nevertheless, Mr. Holbrook
23 was forced to pay “fair share service fees” to the CTA as a condition of his
24 continued employment. *See* Cal. Gov’t Code § 3546(a).

25 18. Ms. Pecanic-Lee is a public-school teacher for the Hacienda La
26 Puente Unified School District. Ms. Pecanic-Lee refuses to join the CTA or

1 its affiliates because she disapproves of their political advocacy and collec-
2 tive-bargaining activities and does not wish to support them in any way.
3 Nevertheless, Ms. Pecanic-Lee was forced to pay “fair share service fees” to
4 the CTA as a condition of her continued employment. *See* Cal. Gov’t Code
5 § 3546(a).

6 19. Mr. Schmus is a former public-school teacher who taught in the Hac-
7 ienda La Puente Unified School District from 2000 through 2015. Mr.
8 Schmus refused to join the CTA or its affiliates because he disapproved of
9 their political advocacy and collective-bargaining activities and did not wish
10 to support them in any way. Nevertheless, Mr. Schmus was forced to pay
11 “fair share service fees” to the CTA as a condition of his continued em-
12 ployment. *See* Cal. Gov’t Code § 3546(a).

13 20. Mr. van der Fluit is a public-school teacher in the Los Angeles School
14 District. Mr. van der Fluit refuses to join the CTA or its affiliates because he
15 disapproves of their political advocacy and collective-bargaining activities
16 and does not wish to support them in any way. Nevertheless, Mr. van der
17 Fluit was forced to pay “fair share service fees” to the CTA as a condition of
18 his continued employment. *See* Cal. Gov’t Code § 3546(a).

19 21. The compelled subsidies that the representative plaintiffs and their
20 fellow class members were forced to pay to the California Teachers Associa-
21 tion and its affiliates as a condition of their employment violates their consti-
22 tutional rights. *See Janus v. Am. Fed’n of State, Cty., & Mun. Employees,*
23 *Council 31*, 138 S. Ct. 2448 (2018).

24 22. The Supreme Court’s ruling in *Janus* is retroactive. *See Harper v.*
25 *Virginia Dep’t of Taxation*, 509 U.S. 86, 96 (1993) (“[A] rule of federal law,
26 once announced and applied to the parties to the controversy, must be given

1 full retroactive effect by all courts adjudicating federal law.”). Because *Janus*
2 is retroactive, any pre-*Janus* collection of agency fees or “fair share service
3 fees” was unlawful and unconstitutional, regardless of whether state law or
4 pre-*Janus* court rulings purported to authorize this conduct.

5 23. The law of California authorizes the CTA and its affiliates to extract
6 money from non-union members as a condition of their employment. *See*,
7 *e.g.*, Cal. Gov’t Code § 3546 (authorizing CTA to collect “fair share service
8 fees” from nonmembers as a condition of employment) (attached to the
9 complaint as Exhibit 1); Cal. Gov’t Code § 3546.3 (authorizing CTA to
10 compel “religious objectors” to remit money to a union-approved charity in
11 lieu of a “fair share service fee”) (attached to the complaint as Exhibit 2).
12 Each of these statutes is unconstitutional, along with any other statute that
13 authorizes or establishes agency shops in public employment, or that allows a
14 public-employee union to garnish the wages of public employees without
15 first securing the employee’s affirmative, written, and freely given consent.

16 24. The California Teachers Association and its affiliates were acting un-
17 der color of state law by imposing and collecting these “fair share service
18 fees.” *See* Cal. Gov’t Code § 3546; *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922
19 (1982).

20 25. The representative plaintiffs and their fellow class members are
21 therefore entitled to a refund of the money that was forcibly taken from them
22 in violation of their constitutionally protected rights. Indeed, the text of 42
23 U.S.C. § 1983 compels this result. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

24 26. The affirmative defense of qualified immunity is unavailable to pri-
25 vate entities such as labor unions. *See Wyatt v. Cole*, 504 U.S. 158, 161 (1992).
26

1 27. There is no “good faith” immunity for private parties who violate 42
2 U.S.C. § 1983 by depriving others of their constitutional rights. *See Howerton*
3 *v. Gabica*, 708 F.2d 380, 385 n.10 (9th Cir. 1983) (“[T]here is no good faith
4 immunity under section 1983 for private parties who act under color of state
5 law to deprive an individual of his or her constitutional rights.”).

6 28. Even if the unions could attempt to assert an affirmative defense such
7 as qualified immunity or “good faith,” those defenses can provide immunity
8 only from money damages, and they do not confer immunity when a plaintiff
9 seeks equitable monetary relief such as backpay, restitution, or unjust en-
10 richment, which the representative plaintiffs and their fellow class members
11 are asserting here. *See Wood v. Strickland*, 420 U.S. 308, 315 n.6 (1975), *over-*
12 *ruled in part on other grounds, Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800 (1982)
13 (“[I]mmunity from damages does not ordinarily bar equitable relief as
14 well.”).

15 29. Finally, even if this Court were to allow the unions to assert a “good
16 faith” defense to the plaintiffs’ section 1983 claims, the unions must *still*
17 show that they complied with pre-*Janus* case law before they can escape lia-
18 bility under section 1983. *See Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, 431 U.S.
19 209, 239–40 (1977). Under *Abood*, public-employee unions were permitted to
20 require non-members to pay only for union activities that were non-
21 ideological, and they were forbidden to require an employee to “contribute
22 to the support of an ideological cause he may oppose as a condition of hold-
23 ing a job.” *Abood*, 431 U.S. at 235; *see also R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. Shew-*
24 *ry*, 423 F.3d 906, 916 (9th Cir. 2005). So the union must, at the very least,
25 prove that it complied with *Abood* and pre-*Janus* court rulings before it can
26 establish a “good faith” defense under section 1983.

1 30. The CTA and its leadership and affiliates expected the Supreme
2 Court to overrule *Abood* in *Janus*, so the unions cannot assert that they acted
3 in accordance with a subjective “good faith” belief that the Supreme Court
4 would approve the legality of its actions. This factual contention is likely to
5 have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investiga-
6 tion or discovery.

7 31. The CTA and its affiliates have committed the torts of conversion
8 and trespass to chattels by appropriating money from nonunion agency-fee
9 payers without securing their affirmative, written, and freely given consent,
10 and they are liable in an action for tort, replevin, unjust enrichment, and res-
11 titution. The CTA cannot defend its tortious conduct by relying on Cal.
12 Gov’t Code § 3546, because that statute is unconstitutional to the extent it
13 purports to shield a public-employee union’s compelled extraction of money
14 from agency-fee payers. Unconstitutional statutes cannot confer immunity
15 on tortious conduct.

16 32. The representative plaintiffs and their fellow class members are enti-
17 tled to a refund of the agency fees that they were forced to pay in violation of
18 their constitutional rights. The plaintiffs are seeking this recovery under 42
19 U.S.C. § 1983 and state tort law, and they are demanding equitable monetary
20 relief including backpay, restitution, and unjust enrichment. The plaintiffs
21 are also seeking money damages to the extent permitted under immunity
22 doctrines.

23 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

24 33. The representative plaintiffs bring this class action under Fed. R. Civ.
25 P. 23(b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3). The class includes all individuals who: (1) are
26 or were employed by the State of California or by any public school or school

1 district located in the State of California; (2) are or were nonmembers of
2 CTA who were compelled by CTA and its affiliates to pay “agency fees” or
3 “fair share service fees” —regardless of whether those fees were remitted to
4 the union, its affiliates, or a third-party organization. The class includes eve-
5 ryone who has ever fallen within this definition, including former and retired
6 teachers or teachers who have moved to other States, and it includes anyone
7 who comes within the class definition at any time before the conclusion of
8 this action.

9 34. The number of persons in the class makes joinder of the individual
10 class members impractical.

11 35. There are questions of fact and law common to all class members.
12 Factually, all class members are public employees and union nonmembers
13 compelled to pay “fair share service fees” to the CTA and its affiliates as a
14 condition of employment. Legally, the U.S. Constitution and California tort
15 law afford the same rights to every member of the class.

16 36. The representative plaintiffs’ claims are typical of other members of
17 the class, because each member of the class has objected to CTA member-
18 ship yet has been forced by state law and contract provisions to financially
19 support the CTA and its inherently political activities.

20 37. The representative plaintiffs adequately represent the interests of the
21 class, and they have no interests antagonistic to the class.

22 38. A class action can be maintained under Rule 23(b)(1)(A) because sep-
23 arate actions by class members could risk inconsistent adjudications on the
24 underlying legal issues.

25 39. A class action can be maintained under Rule 23(b)(1)(B) because an
26 adjudication determining the constitutionality of compulsory “fair share ser-

1 vice fees” will, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of all class
2 members.

3 40. A class action can be maintained under Rule 23(b)(3) because the
4 common questions of law and fact identified in the complaint predominate
5 over any questions affecting only individual class members. A class action is
6 superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of
7 the controversy because, among other things, all class members are subjected
8 to the same violation of their constitutional rights, but the amount of money
9 involved in each individual’s claim would make it burdensome for class
10 members to maintain separate actions.

11 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

12 41. The representative plaintiffs and their fellow class members are suing
13 the CTA and its affiliates, and the members of the Public Employment Rela-
14 tions Board under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28
15 U.S.C. § 2201, each of which supplies a cause of action for the individual and
16 class-wide relief that they are requesting.

17 42. The representative plaintiffs and their fellow class members are also
18 suing the CTA and its affiliates under the state-law actions of conversion,
19 trespass to chattels, replevin, unjust enrichment, restitution, and any other
20 legal or equitable cause of action that offers relief for this unlawful seizure of
21 her personal property. The representative plaintiffs invoke the supplemental
22 jurisdiction of this court over those state-law claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

23 **DEMAND FOR RELIEF**

24 43. The representative plaintiffs respectfully request that the court:

- 25 a. certify a plaintiff class of all nonunion members who have been
26 forced to pay agency fees or “fair share service fees” to the Cal-

1 ifornia Teachers Association or its affiliates or a union-approved
2 third-party organization as a condition of their employment;

3 b. certify a defendant class of all chapters and affiliates of the Cali-
4 fornia Teachers Association;

5 c. declare that the representative plaintiffs and their fellow class
6 members have a constitutional right to decline to join or finan-
7 cially support a public-employee union, and that they cannot be
8 forced to pay money to a union or a union-approved third-party
9 entity as a condition of their employment;

10 d. declare that state tort law protects the right of the representa-
11 tive plaintiffs and their fellow class members not to have their
12 wages garnished or redirected by the CTA or its affiliates with-
13 out their affirmative, written, and freely given consent, and that
14 any federal or state law or collective-bargaining agreement that
15 purports to override these protections of state tort law by allow-
16 ing the CTA to help itself to the wages and paychecks of school
17 employees—or that compels school employees to consent the
18 garnishment of their wages by the CTA or its affiliates as a con-
19 dition of their employment—is unconstitutional and without le-
20 gal effect;

21 e. declare Cal. Gov't Code § 3546 unconstitutional because it al-
22 lows public-employee unions to extract “fair-share service
23 fees” from nonmembers as a condition of their employment,
24 and permanently enjoin the members of the Public Employment
25 Relations Board, and all of their officers, agents, servants, em-
26 ployees, attorneys, and any other person or entity in active con-

1 cert or participation with them, from enforcing Cal. Gov't Code
2 § 3546, or any other provision of state law that authorizes or en-
3 forces public-employee agency shops;

4 f. declare that all collective-bargaining agreements that compel
5 the representative plaintiffs and their fellow class members to
6 pay "agency fees" or "fair share service fees" to the CTA or its
7 affiliates as a condition of their employment violate the consti-
8 tutional rights of the representative plaintiffs and their fellow
9 class members;

10 g. order the CTA and its affiliates, including the NEA, to refund
11 all agency fees or "fair share service fees" that were unconstitu-
12 tionally or unlawfully extracted from the representative plain-
13 tiffs and their fellow class members;

14 h. permanently enjoin the CTA and its affiliates, along with their
15 officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and any other
16 person or entity in active concert or participation with them,
17 from taking or redirecting any type of money from the repre-
18 sentative plaintiffs, their fellow class members, or any other
19 public employee without first obtaining the employee's affirma-
20 tive, written, and freely given consent;

21 i. permanently enjoin all of the defendants, along with their offic-
22 ers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and any other per-
23 son or entity in active concert or participation with them, from
24 enforcing any provision of California law, or any provision of a
25 collective-bargaining agreement, that requires any payment of
26

money as a consequence for exercising one's constitutional right not to join or financially support a public-employee union;

j. award costs and attorneys' fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988;

k. grant all other relief that the Court may deem just, proper, or equitable.

Respectfully submitted.

/s/ Jonathan F. Mitchell

TALCOTT J. FRANKLIN*
Texas Bar No. 24010629
Talcott Franklin PC
1920 McKinney Avenue 7th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 736-8730 (phone)
(800) 727-0659 (fax)
tal@talcottfranklin.com

JONATHAN F. MITCHELL*
Texas Bar No. 24075463
Mitchell Law PLLC
106 East Sixth Street, Suite 900
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 686-3940 (phone)
(512) 686-3941 (fax)
jonathan@mitchell.law

CHRISTOPHER HELLMICH
California Bar No. 224169
Hellmich Law Group, PC
5753-G E. Santa Ana Canyon Rd. #512
Anaheim Hills, California 92807
(949) 287-5708 (phone)
(714) 974- 7733 (fax)
chellmich@hellmichlaw.com

BRADLEY BENBROOK
California Bar No. 177786
Benbrook Law Group, PC
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2530
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 447-4900 (phone)
(916) 447-4904 (fax)
brad@benbrooklawgroup.com

* admitted *pro hac vice*

*Counsel for Plaintiffs and
the Proposed Class*

Dated: February 27, 2019

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on February 27, 2019, I served this document by CM/ECF
upon:

SCOTT A. KRONLAND
JEFFREY B. DEMAINE
REBECCA C. LEE
Altshuler Berzon LLP
177 Post Street Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94108
415-421-7151 (phone)
415-362-8064 (fax)
skronland@altber.com
jdemaine@altber.com
rlee@altshulerberzon.com

Counsel for the Union Defendants

PETER H. CHANG
Office of the Attorney General
California Department of Justice
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, California 94102-7004
(415) 510-3776 (phone)
(415) 703-1234 (fax)
peter.chang@doj.ca.gov

Counsel for the State Defendants

/s/ Jonathan F. Mitchell
JONATHAN F. MITCHELL
Counsel for Plaintiffs and Proposed Class